

Atty Docket No. 9793822.0155
Express Mail No. EL 716466148 US

Application No. 09/980,323
Reply to 06/25/2003 Office Action

REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action dated June 25, 2003, Applicant hereby makes the following response. The present application was filed on March 19, 2002 and included Claims 1-40. In a response to the March 20, 2003 Restriction Requirement, Applicant elected Claims 1-28. Claims 29-40 have been cancelled as being directed to an unelected invention with the proviso that these claims may be prosecuted in subsequent divisional applications. Accordingly, Claims 1-28 remain pending for prosecution with Claims 1 and 14 being independent.

I. Objection to the Specification

The specification was objected to because certain pages did not appear to the Examiner to have legible definitions of the substituents of the structural formulae. Applicant has therefore amended the specification to include new and more legible definitions.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, these claims were rejected because they contain parentheses and brackets which were considered by the Examiner to be vague and indefinite because it was unclear whether applicant was claiming parenthetical subject matter. The Examiner indicated that this rejection would be obviated by deleting the parentheses and brackets in all occurrences. Applicant has so amended the rejected claims and therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-10, 12-14, 16, 19-21, 23-25, 27 and 28 were also rejected because they contained multiple sentences. Applicant has amended the relevant claims to contain only one sentence ending with a period. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Atty Docket No. 9793822.0155
Express Mail No. EL 716466148 US

Applicati n No. 09/980,323
Reply to 06/25/2003 Office Action

Claims 5, 11, 13, 15, 17-18, 22 and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. In view of the amendments made to the claims in order to overcome the rejections, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

III. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and objection and believes that the claims, as amended, present allowable subject matter. However, if the Examiner desires, the applicant is ready for a telephone interview to expedite prosecution. As always, the Examiner is free to call the undersigned at 816.460.2516. Should any fees be necessitated by this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any such fees from Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By



Lara Dickey Lewis, Reg. No. 48,161
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
816-460-2516 (telephone)
816-531-7545 (facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT